

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	). i	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,442		11/05/2003	Yasuhito Soma	HYAE:095D	6393
6160	7590	06/17/2005	•	EXAM	INER
	JRST & W	ENDEL, L.L.P.	. HUBER, PAUL W		
SUITE 210		J.1	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2805				2653	
				DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/700,442	SOMA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Paul Huber	2653				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions o after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commu  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30)  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum stat  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply w Any reply received by the Office later than three months aft earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION.  If 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r inication.  ) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thin utory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON rill, by statute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on .					
•	b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for	/ <del>-</del>					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction.	e withdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to	·					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of:  1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/492,269.  3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>110503</u>.</li> </ol>		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Application/Control Number: 10/700,442

Art Unit: 2653

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, claim 10 recites that the "spot position signal detection means and the tracking error detection means are separated form the semiconductor integrated circuit device and is contained in another semiconductor integrated circuit device." However, this subject matter was not described in the specification, particularly figure 16, in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The spot position signal detection means 110 and the tracking error detection means 108 are not disclosed in the figure or elsewhere within the specification as being "separated" from the semiconductor integrated circuit device to be contained in another semiconductor integrated circuit device as claimed. Note: the semiconductor integrated circuit device claimed in independent claim 9 "comprises" first control means 120, second control means 114, and system operation control means 116, as well as the spot position detection means 110 and tracking error detection means 108. There is no disclosure that the spot position detection means 110 and tracking error detection means 108 are separated from these other elements and contained in another semiconductor integrated circuit as claimed. This is a new matter rejection pertaining to claim 10.

Claim 9 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,373. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because as noted by the Federal Circuit in *Eli Lilly v. Barr*, "[a] a patentable distinction does not lie where a later claim is anticipated by an earlier one." See also *In re Berg* and *In re Goodman* which established that a later genus claim limitation is anticipated by, and therefore not patentably distinct from, an earlier species claim.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van* 

Application/Control Number: 10/700,442

Art Unit: 2653

Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 9 would be allowable if a terminal disclaimer is timely filed as explained above.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art of record considered as a whole fails to teach or suggest a semiconductor integrated circuit device used for an optical disc apparatus having converging means for converging a light spot on the surface of an optical disc, an optical head which has first moving means for moving the light spot, which is applied to the surface of an optical disc, radially across the surface of an optical disc, and second moving means for moving the optical head radially across the surface of the optical disc, for recording or reproducing information, comprising: spot position detection means for generating a spot position signal which indicates a positional difference in a radial direction of the optical disc, between a center of the optical head and the light spot on a receiving element on the optical head, from an electrical signal outputted by the optical head; tracking error detection means for generating a tracking error signal which indicates a positional dislocation between the light spot and a track on an optical disc; first control means for causing a phase compensation loop filter to filter the spot position signal or the tracking error signal to generate a first processed signal and outputting the first processed signal to the first moving means; second control means for causing a traverse loop filter to filter the spot position signal to generate a second processed signal and outputting the second processed signal to the second moving means; and system operation control means for operating the first control means to cause the phase compensation loop filter to filter the spot position signal, the filtering being a phase-lag compensation and a phase-lead compensation filtering, the system operation control means for switching from the spot position signal to the tracking error signal to cause the phase compensation loop filter to filter the tracking error signal, the filtering being a phase-lag compensation and a phase-lead compensation filtering, and operating the second control means after operating the first control means. (bold language emphasized)

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Application/Control Number: 10/700,442

Art Unit: 2653

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Paul Huber at telephone number 571-272-

7588.

Paul Huber Primary Examiner Art Unit 2653

pwh June 7, 2005